IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 74 OF 2005.
IN SUIT NO. 3890 OF 2002

RAMESHKUMAR BHAWARLAL NAHAR ... PETITIONER.
VS.
BHAGELU RATANSI PANDEY & ORS. ... RESPONDENTS.

MR. SAYYED HUSSAIN I/B. M.L.CHATURVEDI FOR THE PETITIONER.
MR. S. UNNIKRISHNAN FOR RESPONDENTS.

CORAM: S.K.SHAH,J.
DATE : December 9, 2005.

P.C.

1. The Alleged contempt is of the Order, dated 17th March, 2005, whereunder the Court had directed the defendants/respondents to furnish to the Plaintiff the address of the 3rd party i.e. M/s. Kadam Associates, which was disclosed by them in the affidavit. The Order, further directs that the Defendants/Respondents shall serve the copy of the alleged agreement, entered into with the 3rd Party, on the Plaintiff, within two weeks.

2. There is no dispute that the Petitioner/ Plaintiff knows the address of M/s. Kadam Associates. The grievance is that the agreement with M/s. Kadam Associates is not furnished. The learned counsel for the Defendants/Respondents states that no such agreement was entered into with M/s. Kadam Associates and therefore, there was no question of furnishing the copy of the agreement with M/s. Kadam Associates. He further submits that they have entered into an agreement with Royal Associates and the copy of the agreement with Royal Associates is served on the Petitioners.

3. Under the circumstances, no action is necessary to be taken against the defendants/respondents for contempt of Courts Order and, as such the petition is disposed of.

....

[S.K.Shah, J.]